



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AFFAIRS OF THE WORLD

BY WILLIS FLETCHER JOHNSON

DOGBERRY. You are to bid any man stand, in the prince's name.

SECOND WATCH. How if a' will not stand?

DOGBERRY. Why, then, take no note of him, but let him go; and presently call the rest of the watch together and thank God you are rid of a knave.

THE Genoa Conference, comprising, as we have been reproachfully reminded a thousand times, all nations that were implicated in the Great War save only the United States, was conceived and convened as an exclusively economic body, from which all politics should be inexorably barred. That was the tenor of the invitations to it, acceptance of which implied a pledge to that effect. Also, an unwritten law, as binding upon every honorable nation as though it were a written, signed and sealed convention, forbade any of the participants to engage in any private negotiations among themselves, and required all that was done to be done with the knowledge and in the presence of all. To that Conference Germany and Soviet Russia were invited, for the first time since the war, to sit as equals at the council board of the nations. And their first acts of consequence were to violate flagrantly the two fundamental principles of the Conference, by making a secret treaty between themselves, and by injecting into the deliberations of the Conference purely political issues of a highly controversial character. The Powers promptly, and most properly, bade them stand—annul their treacherous treaty, and withdraw their political issues. This the culprits as promptly and curtly refused to do. Whereupon the majority of the Powers seemed inclined to take no note of them but to let them go—or have their own way. That those two Governments, which had been admitted to the Conference only on sufferance, should have acted with so gross indecency, can scarcely excite surprise; “for ’tis their nature to.” That their offense should be regarded by most of the Powers with tolerance and substantial

acquiescence may not provoke us to censoriousness, which would be uncalled-for in a matter which is no direct business of ours, but it must add a special fervor to our thankfulness that we at least are not in that galley.

The treacherous Treaty of Rapallo affords another illustration of the repetitions of history, being the third such performance by the same two countries within a single lifetime. Just thirty-five years ago Germany, under Bismarck's direction, coerced Italy and Austria-Hungary into joining her in a Triple Alliance against France and Russia; and then, before the ink was fairly dry upon the signatures to that instrument, Germany entered into a secret alliance with Russia against Austria-Hungary and Italy. Such was the cynical morality of the "Honest Broker". Thirty years later, at the crisis of the World War, Germany and Soviet Russia made the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, in which the latter betrayed her allies as actually as the former had potentially betrayed hers a generation before. Now the triple cord of treachery is completed by the same delectable pair in the Treaty of Rapallo; an equally flagrant betrayal not indeed of allies but at least of those Powers which had with unexampled generosity consented to repose in them the confidence due only to faith-keeping nations. Strange, that conduct should be condoned among nations which among self-respecting individuals would not be countenanced for a moment. Still more strange—or perhaps less so, in view of the sequence of the events—is the widely proclaimed assumption that Germany and Russia will presently be taken into the full fellowship of the League of Nations and that then the United States will simply have to enter that same fold.

The great coal strike has evoked many suggestions, requests and demands for intervention by the Federal Government, in accord with the precedent set by President Roosevelt in 1902, when the last former strike occurred in the anthracite region. That precedent seems, however, to be not correctly remembered or understood by those who have clamored for instant and dictatorial action; the fact being that President Roosevelt was conspicuously deliberate and non-dictatorial; and though in the end

his course proved effective and satisfactory, it led to settlement through precisely such a compromise as many are now inclined to condemn in advance. In April, 1902, the miners demanded shorter hours, better pay, and recognition of their union, all of which the operators refused. The miners then proposed but the operators refused arbitration; and repeated efforts by the National Civic Federation aggravated rather than ameliorated the trouble. Early in May a general strike began, but not until a month later, when the mines began to be flooded and the distress of famine prevailed in that region, did the President attempt to effect a settlement. His proposal of arbitration was rejected, whereupon he contented himself with directing his Commissioner of Labor to investigate and report upon the general conditions of the mining industry. The "fight to a finish" went on, with much arson, dynamiting, rioting and loss of life. Thousands of State troops were sent to the field, and demands were made upon the President (by the mine operators) for Federal troops, which he refused. At the beginning of October, five months after the beginning of the strike, when the price of coal had risen five or six fold and the public faced winter weather with empty bins, the President again called the leaders of both sides into conference at the White House, but again without avail. But ten days later, through the coöperation of Mr. J. P. Morgan, who had returned from Europe, President Roosevelt got both sides to submit to arbitration, pending the result of which the miners immediately returned to work, more than five months after the beginning of the strike. More than five months later still the arbitrators made their report, exactly "splitting the difference" between the demands of the miners and the contentions of the operators; a compromise which was loyally accepted by both sides and which remained in force for nineteen years, until the present spring. Such was the "precedent" set for Presidential intervention at this time. Perhaps the most pertinent and significant comparison between the two cases is that which shows the root of the trouble to be precisely the same in both, to wit, over-development of the mining industry. So many mines are being operated that if they are kept going all the time there is a production of coal thirty per cent or more in excess of the demand

and use. The mines are therefore shut down and the men thrown into idleness about one-third of the time, and the men have to maintain themselves and their families for three-thirds of the time on the earnings of only two-thirds. Obviously a man is better off if he works 300 days for five dollars a day than if he gets seven dollars a day and works only 200 days. We must therefore regard it as a hopeful symptom that many men are quitting the mines and taking up farming or other occupations. If their places are not filled, but there is a material permanent reduction of the mining force, it will be for the good of all concerned.

Much more attention has been paid to the dismissal—without charges—of a score of employees of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing than was generally given to the wholesale demoralization of the Civil Service during the preceding Administration; perhaps because much better things are expected of the present than were expected of the former régime. There appears to have been no violation of the spirit and intent of the law, the only question undetermined at this writing being whether certain technicalities of procedure were observed. Immeasurably more serious was the action of Congress in exempting from the Civil Service law the army of agents for the enforcement of the Volstead Act. This utterly indefensible thing was done, it is said, at the solicitation—dictation would perhaps be the better word—of the Anti-Saloon League propagandists. The result, according to Mr. William Dudley Foulke, Acting President of the National Civil Service Reform League, has been that “this branch of the service is so honeycombed with corruption that it is known that hundreds of thousands of dollars of graft have been taken by those engaged in it, some of whom are under indictment”. Some members of both Houses of Congress seem to look upon this state of affairs with complacency, and are assuming an attitude of hostility to the entire merit system. It should be very distinctly and emphatically understood by all whom it may concern that while on the one hand the American people do not want the Administration to be embarrassed, its work to be impeded, and its economies to be balked, by the enforced retention of dishonest, incompetent or superfluous employees, on the other hand

with equal resolution they are determined not to permit the merit system to be broken down or impaired and the Government to be dragged back into the debauch of spoilsmanship.

The death of the Pundita Ramabai, occurring almost simultaneously with the arrest and imprisonment of Mr. Mohandas Gandhi, suggests an instructive contrast between two of the most noteworthy figures that have arisen in India in our day. Coming of a far more exalted caste and lineage than Mr. Gandhi, and possessing probably higher culture and fuller education,—she was the first Indian woman that ever received the highest academic degree of Sarasvati,—Ramabai consistently aimed at constructive instead of destructive work; she advocated instead of forbidding coöperation with British official and other agencies; she sought to utilize instead of renouncing the modern arts of European and American civilization for the benefit of India; and she accepted instead of rejecting the Christian religion. Thus in almost every important particular she was the exact opposite of Mr. Gandhi. We may unhesitatingly add that the work which she achieved for the education and emancipation of the women of India, and particularly for their redemption from the appalling curse of child-widowhood, greatly outranks in value anything which has thus far been set down to Mr. Gandhi's credit.

The entrance of Arthur James Balfour into the House of Lords follows his acceptance of the most exalted of all the Orders of Knighthood, but is of objective more than subjective significance. There will be no change in spirit from the Great Commoner to the Belted Earl. The scion of one of the proudest and most ancient families of the peerage and imbued with the very quintessence of aristocracy, he has always been masterfully democratic at heart, as both his political course at home and his cordial and affectionate regard for America have shown, and he will be none the less democratic in spirit in his seat in the Gilded Chamber. The chief purport of his translation is the cumulative demonstration which is thus given of the radically changing character of the House of Lords. While a large proportion of the members of that body hold their places by inheritance, the overwhelming

majority of those who exercise real influence are men who won their spurs in statesmanship as Commoners, or who earned peerages by their great achievements in literature, science or art. When we think of the House of Lords to-day we think of such men as Bryce, Morley, Milner, Curzon, Kelvin, Northcliffe, Mount Stephen, Allenby and their compeers. Into such company it does not seem unfitting or incongruous for the Earl of Balfour of Whittingehame to enter.

The commemoration of the centenary of the birth of Ulysses S. Grant was not dimmed nor dwarfed by contrast with the great captains of a far greater war than that in which he rendered his priceless services and won his undying fame. Indeed, its interest was strikingly enhanced by the participation of one of the very greatest—perhaps we might also say, most Grant-like—of those later commanders. For it was happily possible for Marshal Joffre on that anniversary day to be in New York, to pay tribute at the Riverside mausoleum, and to unveil a monumental bust of the great American soldier in the Hall of Fame—which, with characteristic taste worthy of immortal remembrance, he elected to do, wearing the uniform of a Marshal of France rather than the robe of a Doctor of Laws with which the University on that occasion invested him. It would be unprofitable to attempt comparison or contrast between Grant and Marshal Joffre, or any other commander of the Great War. Yet he must be lacking in perception who does not see a likeness so marked as to amount to practical identity between them in what must after all be accounted the supreme respect. One of his shrewdest and keenest critical observers declared that it was in and through his moral greatness, more than all else, that Grant rose to preëminence in the Civil War; and it was precisely that quality which enabled Marshal Joffre to achieve salvation for mankind in the Miracle of the Marne.